

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 20 are pending. By this amendment, claims 1, 12, and 19 are amended and claim 7 is cancelled. No new matter is introduced. Reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Entry of the amendments to claims 1, 12, and 19 is proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 because the amendments: (a) cancel claims, (b) do not raise any new issues requiring examination, and (c) place the claims in better condition for appeal.

On page 3 the Office Action rejects claims 1 – 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent 5,590,056 to Barritz (hereafter Barritz) in view of U.S. Patent 6,301,615 to Kutcher (hereafter Kutcher). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Considering claim 1, the Office Action asserts that by combining Kutcher's "filters" with Barritz's configuration file to arrive at the claimed application-specific interfaces. In essence, the Office Action asserts that Kutcher's filters are the same as the claimed application-specific interfaces.

Kutcher describes the filters thusly:

Each filter 26 is designed to be used with a particular performance monitoring utility. The filter accepts input in the format generated by the corresponding performance monitoring utility and produces key-value pairs which can be derived from the output of that performance monitoring utility. If the performance monitoring utility is changed so that it generates a different output than the previous version, the filter must also be modified to accept the new output. The filter may handle the output of the performance monitoring utility in various ways to produce the key-value pairs. The filter may simply associate the performance monitoring utility output values with particular keys, or the output values may be manipulated mathematically to produce the values associated with the keys. For example, the values may be normalized, or values for parameters which are not included in the output may be calculated.

See column 8, lines 43 – 58.

The above passage makes clear that the filter receives output data (output 50) from a performance monitoring utility 21 and reformats that data (into key value pairs 60 – 67) for further use in Kutcher's system. Furthermore, each filter 26 "is designed to be used with a particular performance monitoring utility. Note that Kutcher never discloses that the "filters" 26 are in anyway coupled to or designed to operation with a specific application. Instead, the filters 26 are specific to a performance monitoring utility. Furthermore, while not a model of clarity, the Kutcher specification distinguishes between performance monitoring utilities and applications: "Various ones of the computers are configured to execute performance monitoring utilities ...

and a client application.” See column 3, lines 22 – 25. Thus, and contrary to the Office Action’s assertion, Kutcher’s filters are not application-specific interfaces, and the combination of Barritz and Kutcher does not disclose or suggest the claimed element of application-specific interfaces.


In contrast to Barritz and Kutcher, claim 1 recites “a configuration consisting of application-specific interfaces” These application-specific interfaces couple the performance management tools to the applications that the performance management tools are designed to monitor. This is in contrast to Kutcher, where in the filters 26 are coupled to the output of the performance monitoring utilities. Thus, Barritz and Kutcher, individually and in combination, do not disclose or suggest all the elements of claim 1, and claim 1 is patentable.

Similar to claim 1, independent claims 12 and 19 also recite the “application-specific interfaces.” Accordingly, claims 12 and 19 are also patentable. Claims 2 – 6 and 9 – 11 depend from patentable claim 1; claims 13 – 18 depend from patentable claim 12; and claim 20 depends from patentable claim 19. For these reasons, and the additional features they recite, claims 2 – 6, 9 – 11, 13 – 18, and 20 are also patentable. Claim 7 is cancelled and its rejection is moot. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 – 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Prompt examination and allowance are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desired in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant’s undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



John K. Harrop
Registration No. 41,817
Andrews Kurth LLP
1701 Pennsylvania Ave, N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20006
Tel. (202) 662-3050
Fax (202) 662-2739

Date: **March 25, 2005**